



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

On p. 152, speaking with reference to the Supreme Court, Mr. Wise says: "even concerning such of its decisions as have been refuted by the logic of events, the wisdom and justice of its action upon the law and the facts then before it, are now universally admitted, however bitterly they might have been aspersed at the time those decisions were rendered." It seems probable that the author had in mind, among the cases which had given rise to criticism, that of Dred Scott. Opinions still differ as to whether what the court in that case assumed to decide would have been decided rightly had the court been called on to decide it at all. The unwise in that case of the court's traveling outside the record to express its opinion upon a question of then current political discussion has, by the lapse of time, become not less but more apparent. On pp. 189 and 190, the author says: "On the other hand, those who in that day (1787) were so ardent for the absolute liberty of the press could not have foreseen the immense increase in public and private printed matter which was to occur, the almost unlimited power for good or evil which the press was to possess, the irreparable nature of the injuries which it is often able to inflict, or the irresponsible hands into which so large a portion of the press of our day was in time to pass." Does the author really believe that the press today is in less responsible hands than it was in 1787? The worst of the yellow journals are pecuniarily able to answer for any conceivable judgment that could be reasonably given against them. Not so much could have been said for most of the editors who libeled the first President of the United States.

It is doubtful whether all of his readers will agree with the statement with which he closes his treatise, that "we sorely need a laboring class not composed of individuals who aspire to higher education, political prominence, social importance, and even the Presidency of the United States." There are other things we need more.

JOHN C. ROSE.

*War Government, Federal and State, in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania and Indiana, 1861-1865.* By WILLIAM B. WEEDEN. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1906. Pp. xxv, 379.)

Said a leading American journal, shortly after the close of the Civil War: "We all expect sometime to write out our impressions of the

war." Mr. Weeden is one who has for many years contemplated the rendering of this service. He received encouragement and advice from George Bancroft and Francis Parkman, direction and suggestion from Justin Winsor, and much sympathy from Herbert B. Adams. Yet, in spite of all this, we learn from the opening paragraph of his introductory chapter that he was late in reaching a definite decision to write and publish. At times he was under the impression that enough had been already written; then again, he for a time, sought to persuade students of the newer generation to write upon the perplexing interplay of State and Federal governments during the great struggle. Finally, he was impelled to action by the remark of a "Nestor," whose name is not given: "Ah! those who write about it must have lived it." Realizing that these were already few and were rapidly diminishing in number, Mr. Weeden entered upon his task.

The book is not simply a record of personal experiences and observations, it is better described as a somewhat extended study of the Federal government in coöperation with four leading States for the suppression of the rebellion. The four States are: Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania and Indiana. In a sense the States selected are representative of the loyal States in general, yet for various reasons they held special and peculiar relations to the Federal administration. The materials chiefly used are the records in the archives of the four States and the published Official Records of the Rebellion. But in the matter of interpretation and the selection of materials, the author is guided and controlled by individual conviction. The records of history are used to illuminate an experience or to maintain an opinion.

Our author's general point of view is that of an extreme Unionist. He regards the Union as antedating the States, and the States as having no standing except through their relation to the Union. The teaching of Goldwin Smith and Henry Cabot Lodge to the effect that before the Civil War, the Union of 1789 was a mere compact, dissoluble at will, is characterized as a modern heresy, and two sentences are quoted from an argument by D. H. Chamberlain which are declared to kill the vagary, though these sentences simply reiterate our author's own opinion. This mode of reasoning is repeated too often. An *ipse dixit* is accepted as proof or demonstration.

Besides the introduction and the chapter on the Genesis of the Union there are chapters on the Executive Crisis, Administration, State Support, Federal and State Interferences, Party Estrangement,

The People under Compulsion, Government, and The Union Vindicated and Developed. In these nine chapters, three distinct stages of the war are recognized and discussed from many points of view. First is the period covering the first fourteen months, when the movement for the suppression of the rebellion was chiefly in the hands of the loyal governors. This was a time when a people practically united was seeking to end the war at once by the most ready and available means at hand. Then follows the rise of partisan controversy and division in the loyal ranks, leading to the third and final stage, in which the full force of the nation is levied upon for the defense of the Union.

The author contends that the war ought to have been ended promptly and speedily by the overwhelming forces which the loyal governors were ready to place, armed and equipped, in the hands of the general government. He is severe in his criticism of Mr. Lincoln and the departments at Washington for not availing themselves of this ample and adequate power at their command. This part of the book is in many respects the most satisfactory. Public records are relied upon for support of the views advanced. Extreme Unionist though he is, the writer shows, nevertheless, a full appreciation of the position and power of the States. "What saving of blood and treasure, of agony and endurance in these struggling peoples, both North and South, would have been made if the resources of the Northern States as States could have been a little better applied in the years 1861 and 1862!" (p. 176). He looks upon the governors as "detached but assimilated war ministers," collaborating with the executive of the nation, maintaining, nevertheless, with logical consistency, this belief in the dominance of the one united people. "The tremendous interplay of Federal and State power had precipitated on these heads of States such responsibility as no government had ever witnessed. These men were the direct exponents of the people in the early stages of the rebellion. They put into action and accomplished in fact the popular desire, and registered the popular mandate." (p. 222)

It is true that after Sumter and Bull Run there was a great outpouring of men and treasure on the part of the Northern States; it is also true that this ardor afterwards abated, making it necessary to resort to compulsion in order to fill the depleted armies. Mr. Weeden may not be correct in apportioning the blame for this change to the government at Washington; but there is great gain in having the correspondence between the governors and other public men so thor-

oughly exploited by one whose words burn with the ardor of conviction.

In criticising the National administration, Mr. Weeden is dealing with men whose end and aim he heartily approves. His strictures are here tempered with mildness and moderation and many of them are supported by evidence. But when he passes to the subject of the rise of party division in the midst of the war, he deals with men whose alleged objects do not command his sympathy. A passage from his preface may serve to suggest our author's method of treating this part of the subject. Rhodes' history is highly commended for its absolute impartiality; then follows: "I differ in construing the facts at some important points, as will appear in the following pages. Very likely the difference is that I could not rise to the heights of his sedate charitableness." Signs of such inability do indeed appear on various pages. Governor Seymour, Mr. Vallandigham and all who opposed the administration are branded as copperheads, and are described with the feeling of one who has indeed lived the history, one who has forgotten nothing and abated nothing throughout all the intervening forty years. The statement is reiterated that the men of the North who arrayed themselves against the policy of the Federal government are to be visited with increasing reprobation as time goes on.

On p. 300 appears a quotation from a letter of General Dix to Governor Seymour, written August 8, 1863, three weeks after the bloody riots in New York city. The object of the letter is to secure the active coöperation of the governor in the execution of the draft. In the course of his argument, General Dix admits a qualified justification of the conduct of the Southerners who resist the government; then he says: "Among us resistance to the law by those who claim and enjoy the protection of the government has no semblance of justification and becomes the blackest of political crimes." I read this sentence, as quoted by Mr. Weeden, supposing that the General had in mind the citizens of New York whose hands were red with riot and murder, but six pages further on I am told that General Dix set forth the *governor's* course as "the blackest of political crimes." I have since read the letter as it appears in the records and I am sure that the governor did not so understand it. This is a case where a larger measure of sedate charitableness would have contributed to clearness and correct understanding of the facts.

This part of the book is of especial value from the fact that it fur-

nishes a key to the interpretation of a large amount of the literature of the Civil War. On p. 58 there is a reference to Lowell's teaching "that the Providence of history holds in the imminent thunderbolt some power to solve social evils which neither prudent citizen nor peaceful moralist can comprehend, much less administer." If this teaches anything it is that above and beyond human reason and human initiative there is a Power which assists men in solving social evils. Yet Mr. Weeden makes the Civil War an instance of the intervention of this Providence which is above reason, and at the same time he glorifies war as "the final reason, the clarifying and purifying master, which rends the shams of politics and amends the faulty ways of decadent civilization."

It is possible to make these words harmonize with the teachings of Lowell by identifying "final reason" with Providence, or the elemental powers of the universe. In that case, when men commit themselves to the arbitrament of war, the ordinary processes of human reason are at an end; passion tends to dominate reason. But there is abundant evidence that Mr. Weeden does not make this distinction. He accounts himself to be exercising conclusive ratiocination and pronouncing final historic judgment while branding Villandigham as a double-dyed traitor, Seymour as the blackest of criminals and Horace Greeley as a fool. The real fault of these men is, as the author abundantly shows, that they continued to reason and argue after the inauguration of a state of war just as they did in time of peace. They ought to have known that after Sumter had fallen the time for debate was past. That they did not perceive this, is their crime, their folly. The case is clearly one for persuasion rather than for vituperation, and a display of excessive passion is itself evidence of the presence of that which is either above or below reason. Extravagant abuse stimulates compassion and develops a disposition to defend the victim. If Mr. Weeden really wishes coming generations to reprobate the Northern reactionaries of the war-time with ever-increasing fervor, he would come much nearer to accomplishing his purpose by casting his utterances in the quiet form of moderate persuasion; yet the entire book is well worth a careful reading, and it is to be hoped that many more of the diminishing number of those who lived the Civil War will attempt to portray its history.

A few minor errors are noted. On p. 220, Wilson of Iowa is mistakenly called "Governor Wilson." On p. 322, the Garrisonian

abolitionists are credited with believing that the national government had power to free the slaves. It was, in fact, over this issue that the abolitionists divided, the followers of Garrison opposing this interpretation of the Constitution. M. Ostrogorski's name is repeatedly misspelled, and Mr. D. H. Chamberlain appears in the index as D. A. Chamberlain.

JESSE MACY.

*The Legislative History of Naturalization in the United States from the Revolutionary War to 1861.* By FRANK GEORGE FRANKLIN, Ph.D. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1906. Pp. 330.)

As the author states in the preface, the subject of naturalization has assumed a larger importance in the history of the United States than in that of any other nation. It accordingly is not surprising that the subject has engaged the attention of Congress almost continuously, and that the laws on the subject have been modified from time to time to adapt them to the ever-varying conditions arising in a country which, in the course of a century, has developed into a world power. In his *Legislative History of Naturalization*, Professor Franklin reviews in detail, with great accuracy and in a scholarly manner, all actions relative to naturalization taken by Congress down to 1861, whether or not such action resulted in actual legislation; and he also considers the conditions which have influenced such action. To write the book the author has relied only on original sources of information, such as the journals of both houses of Congress, memorials of legislatures, reports of committees and reports of debates. He cites the authority on which he relies for every important statement. The book unquestionably is a valuable contribution to the existing literature on the history of the United States.

The desire to encourage immigration and to extend the rights of citizenship to those who have taken up arms in the defense of the United States, seems chiefly to have influenced the policy of the legislation on the subject. It appears that during the period immediately preceding the Revolutionary War, each colony possessed the power to naturalize foreigners, subject to control by the Crown. One of the grievances against the King of Great Britain referred to in the Declaration of Independence is, that "he has endeavored to prevent